UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,772	10/19/1999	OSAMU YAMADA	862.3073	3279

5514 7590 02/16/2007

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
LE, BRIAN Q	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/420,772	YAMADA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian Q. Le	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,7,12-16 and 19-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 4, 7, 12-16 and 19-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment and Arguments

1. Applicant's amendment filed December 08, 2006, has been entered and made of record.

2. The rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 7, 12-16 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is withdrawn.

3. The objection of claims 1, 3-4, 7, 12-16 and 19-22 is withdrawn.

4. Applicant's arguments with regard to claims 1, 4, 7, 12-16, and 19-22 have been fully considered, but are not considered persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues (bottom of page 11 of Remark) that Miyashita does not teach two saturation curves as claimed. Again, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Miyashita et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,031,543 clearly teaches two saturation conversion lines (FIG. 29-31; column 8, lines 10-29; and column 9, lines 54-63 "FIGS. 29 and 30 show examples of **conversion curves** ...by the same operation") which is set independently from each other (column 9, lines 54-56 "FIGS. 29 and 30 show examples of **conversion curves** the specified conversion intensity of **which differs from each other**". It appears to the Examiner that the claim language is broadly claimed and thus is subjective to reasonable interpretation.

To further assist the Applicant with the guidance with claim language interpretations so that the Applicant can add further/more details limitations from the specification to the claims to overcome the prior arts, the Examiner is presenting MPEP, section 2111, Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation as follow: "The court explained that "reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from reading limitations of the specification into a claim,' to thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the

claim." The court found that applicant was advocating the latter, i.e., the impermissible importation of subject matter from the specification into the claim.). See also In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit. Rather, the "PTO applies to verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in applicant's specification.")".

Thus, the rejections of all of the claims are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. The USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

> Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.
>
> When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

> In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. See Lowry, 32 F.3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

7. Claim(s) 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows.

Claim 19 recites "A recording medium comprising program codes of an image processing method, and at least comprising:" embodying functional descriptive material. However, the claim does not define a computer-readable medium or memory and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e., "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized" – Guidelines Annex IV). That is, the scope of the presently claimed "A recording medium" (line 1 of claim 19) can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to embody the program on "computer-readable medium" or equivalent in order to make the claim statutory. Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure.

Claim 22 is rejected based on the same reason as claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

9. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

10. Claims 1, 4, 7, 12-16, and 19 - 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyashita U.S. Patent No. 6,031,543.

Referring to claim 1, Miyashita teaches an image processing apparatus comprising:

Saturation calculation (saturation correction) unit (FIG. 16) arranged to calculate saturation information of an image;

A first setting unit, arranged to set a first conversion line for a low-saturation side; (column 6, lines 48-62; column 8, lines 3-15 and 37-55 and column 10, lines 25-44) (Miyashita teaches the data manipulation of parameters for color correction which including hue or saturation (column 8, line 9) for whether at low or high-saturation), wherein the first conversion line converts a minimum input value of a saturation of the image to a minimum output value (low saturation/a_{MIN}/b_{MIN}) (a_{MIN}/b_{MIN} by the linear conversion curve will generate the minimum output value) (Please refer to column 12, lines 30-65; column 13, lines 5-47 and FIG. 33-FIG. 37).

A second setting unit, arranged to set a second conversion parameter for a high-saturation side; (column 6, lines 48-62; column 8, lines 3-15 and 37-55 and column 10, lines 25-44) (Miyashita teaches the data manipulation of parameters for color correction which including hue or saturation (column 8, line 9) for whether at low or high-saturation), wherein the second conversion line converts a substantially maximum input value of a saturation of the image to a substantially maximum output value (high saturation/a_{MAX}/b_{MAX}) (a_{MAX}/b_{MAX} by the linear conversion curve will generate the maximum output value) (Please refer to column 12, lines 30-65; column 13, lines 5-47 and FIG. 33-FIG. 37), wherein the second conversion line intersects the first conversion line (FIG. 29-31 and column 9, lines 54-63) and is set independently of the first conversion line (FIG. 16, FIG. 27C, FIG. 29 and FIG. 31).

A saturation conversion characteristic generating unit arranged to generate a saturation conversion characteristic on the basis of the first conversion line, for the low-saturation side, and the second conversion line, for the high-saturation side (column 8, lines 3-29);

A saturation conversion unit (FIG 44 and FIG 45) arranged to convert the saturation (column 3, line 40-44) of the image on the basis of the saturation conversion characteristic.

It is clear that saturation calculation also is saturation correction especially as demonstrated in FIG 16, a saturation correction requires analysis of color and colors saturation conversion.

Referring to claim 4, Miyashita teaches the apparatus further comprising:
An instruction unit arranged to accept an instruction input by a user (column 3, line 58-60; column 4, lines 1-26) in order to determine the first conversion line, for the low-saturation side, and the second conversion parameter, for the high-saturation side (column 10, lines 22-29).

Referring to claim 7, Miyashita teaches the apparatus wherein the saturation conversion characteristic exhibits a monotonous increase (column 11, line 33-46).

Referring to claim 12, Miyashita discloses the apparatus further comprising:

A detection unit arranged to detect a color distribution of the image (FIG 6, FIG 7 and column 5, line 54);

A generation unit arranged to generate gradation correction information (column 8, line 44-46) of the image on the basis of the color distribution; and

A gradation correction unit arranged to perform gradation correction of the image on the basis of the gradation correction information (column 8, line 22-29 and column 8, line 52-55).

For claim 13, Miyashita also teaches the apparatus wherein said saturation conversion unit (FIG 44 and FIG 45) performs saturation conversion on an image which has undergone the gradation correction (column 9, line 21-24) by said gradation correction unit. Also it is inherent that gradation correction is required during the gradation conversion process which is clearly described by Miyashita.

Referring to claim 14, Miyashita further teaches the apparatus wherein said generation unit comprises:

A highlight calculation unit (FIG 25, FIG 26A, FIG 26B, FIG 26E and FIG 26F) arranged to calculate highlight area information (column 9, line 25-31) of an image on the basis of the color distribution; and

A white balance calculation unit (FIG 28-115 and 117) arranged to calculate white balance information on the basis of the highlight area information (FIG 29-115 and 117, FIG 30-

115 and 117, FIG 31-115 and FIG 32-115) and a predetermined highlight value (column 10, line 24-32, "HL" parameters), and wherein

Said gradation correction unit corrects gradation of the image on the basis of the white balance information and the highlight value (column 10, line 25-44).

It is inherent that highlight and intensity are the white balance calculation. Without these two parameters, white balance calculation can not be processed properly.

Referring to claim 15, Miyashita discloses the apparatus wherein said generation unit comprises:

A shadow calculation unit arranged to calculate shadow information of an image (FIG 25, FIG26C, FIG26D-FIG26F, FIG28-32); and

A black balance calculation unit (FIG 25, FIG26C, FIG26D-FIG26F and FIG28-116 and 117) arranged to calculate black balance information on the basis of the shadow area information (FIG 28, 116-117; FIG 29,116-117; FIG 30, 116-117) and a predetermined shadow value (column 10, line 24-32, "SD" parameters), wherein

Said gradation correction unit corrects gradation of the image on the basis of the black balance information and the shadow value (column 10, line 25-44).

It is inherent that shadow and the intensity are also the black calculation. Without these two significant means, black balance calculation can not be determined.

For claims 16, please refer back to the explanation of claims 1 and 3.

For claim 19, please refer to claim 1 for all the limitation. Furthermore, Miyashita discussed the concept of recording medium (storage system) (column 1, 64-67) that allow program codes (software or executable program) (column 3, line 62-63) to allow user to control

the image processing method. Therefore, it is inherent to have a recording medium comprising program codes of an image processing method comprises the limitation of claim 1.

Regarding claim 20. please refer back to claim 4 for the explanation.

For claims 21-22, please refer back to claims 1 and 19 for the teachings and the explanations.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Q. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-7424. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M - 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mathew Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BL
February 14, 2007

MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600